From: Croxton, David [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=CA7B9940863640D5B96F4295EA3C9641-CROXTON, DAVE]

Sent: 10/2/2018 5:56:02 PM

To: Opalski, Dan [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=8b5ed6410d934bf699a008a252791a55-Opalski, Dan]

CC: Hodgkiss, Miranda [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=9d441ddb44ac4ed486058d2c2690b977-Hodgkiss, Miranda]

Subject: Deschutes Draft Response letter to CLIPA for your review

Attachments: Ltr from CLIPA rcvd 8-29-18.pdf; Response to Hladick ltr CLIPA.DOCX

Dan,

We received two very similar letters at the same time from a Capitol Lake Association related to the Deschutes, one addressed to you and the other to Hladick. Our draft response from Hladick is attached as well as PDFs of the received letters. The Hladick letter was never identified as a controlled correspondence to my knowledge. A couple considerations as you review this draft response:

1) We are only planning to send one letter that addresses both letters. Both letters are essentially to transmit copies of a report and a plan they produced. Would you like us to more explicitly state that this letter is also responding to their letter to you?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

THanks

2)